

REMARKS

Applicant has amended all of the presently pending independent claims to recite in each of them that the sealed chamber has only one inlet and only one path between the only one inlet and the outlet through which the fluid can flow. This is shown in Figs. 2, 5-8 of the application as filed and thus this amendment does not give rise to new matter.

In the Final Rejection:

a) the Examiner said that the present title of the application "Fluid Flow Sensor" is still not descriptive. Applicant has changed the title to "Purge Gas Sensor" which applicant believes is more descriptive of the invention.

b) the Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement as the original written description does not describe first and second flow restrictors through which the fluid must flow in its entirety. Applicant has amended all of the independent claims to delete therefrom the "entirety" language.

c) the Examiner has also rejected all of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because in regard to the independent claims it is not clear at what reference point the fluid flow in its entirety. Also the recitation in those claims of "its" is ambiguous. Applicant has amended all of the independent claims to delete therefrom "its entirety."

d) the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, 18-20, 23 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Fassbinder.

Fassbinder shows in Fig. 1 a device that has an inlet 8 for a carrier gas that enters collar 2 through a gas pipe 6 and an inlet to the collar 2 to the left of constriction 3 for the solid particle gas suspension and an outlet from the collar 2 for the carrier gas and suspension combination to the left of constriction 4. Fassbinder shows in Fig. 2 a device that has pipe line 20 for carrier gas that enters a cyclone 24. A

10/092,773

portion of the entering carrier gas is removed through discharge pipe 25 and is fed back to the main quantity of carrier gas through piper 23 after the constriction 22. Thus neither the embodiment shown in Fig. 1 nor the embodiment shown in Fig. 2 have a sealed chamber with only one inlet and only one path between the only one inlet and the outlet through which the fluid can flow as called for in the independent claims as amended herein.

e) the Examiner has rejected claims 6, 14, 21, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Fassbinder in view of Allan and claims 7, 15, 17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Fassbinder in view of Dimeff.

All of these claims depend on an associated one of independent claims 1, 11, 16, 19, 26, 28 and 29. Neither Allan or Dimeff alone or in any combination with Fassbinder supply that which is missing from Fassbinder as regards the invention and taught and claimed by applicant in the independent claims as amended herein.

Reconsideration of the Final Rejection and continued examination of this application under Rule 114 is requested.

*****Signature and Certificate of Mailing Appear On The
Following Page*****

10/092,773

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

10/27/03

Michael M. Rickin

Michael M. Rickin
Reg. No. 26,984
Attorney for Applicant(s)
ABB Inc.
29801 Euclid Avenue
Wickliffe, OH 44092-1898
(440) 585-7840

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on the 27th day of October, 2003.

Respectfully,

Debra A. Rietze

Date:

10/27/03